



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,751	05/26/2004	Fonda J. Daniels	014682.000007	3750

44870 7590 09/26/2008  
MOORE & VAN ALLEN, PLLC For IBM  
P.O. Box 13706  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER
----------

SANDERS, AARON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/26/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/709,751	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DANIELS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> AARON SANDERS	<b>Art Unit</b> 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 11, 13-16 and 20-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 11, 13-16 and 20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's amendment filed 9 July 2008 has been entered. Claims 1, 11, 13-16, and 20-22 are pending. Claims 1 and 13-15 are currently amended. Claims 2-10, 12, 17-19, and 23-45 are cancelled. No claims are new. This action is FINAL, as necessitated by amendment.

### ***Claim Objections***

As per claim 1, the limitations "receiving a request for information" and "interrogating a plurality of content sources... to retrieve information to satisfy the request" are unclear. According to the specification (see the discussion of Fig. 3A), the method receives a request for a content object and interrogates content sources to retrieve the content object. While a content object is "information," the claim already recites a content object, so using the broader "information" makes it unclear what is actually being requested and retrieved. The limitation "collecting the content object... in response to the content object being responsive to the request" is also unclear because the interrogating step retrieved "information," not a content object.

Further, the limitation "collecting the content object from a respective one the plurality of content sources containing the content object" is unclear. The claim does not store "content objects" in "content sources," rather they are stored in a "federated content repository." While Applicant may intend that the "federated content repository" comprises "a plurality of content sources," this is not clear.

Further, "the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object" lacks antecedent basis in the claim. While the preamble mentions "privacy

Art Unit: 2168

preferences,” there is no previous mention of “privacy preferences... of the author or owner of the content object” or “other restriction preferences.” There is also no previous mention of an “author or owner of the content object.”

As per claims 1 and 15, the “content provider” lacks antecedent basis in the claims.

As per claim 15, the phrase “the author or owner of the content object” lacks antecedent basis in the claim. There is no previously mentioned “owner of the content object.”

As per claim 21, “previously amended” is an improper status identifier. The proper status identifier is “previously presented.” See 37 C.F.R. 1.121(c).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 11, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohrer et al., U.S. 2003/0088520, in view of Kohane et al., U.S. 2004/0199765.

1. Bohrer teaches “*A method for managing privacy preferences or access to restricted information, comprising,*” see par. 1, “methods, systems and business methods to enforce privacy preferences on exchanges of personal data across a network.”

Bohrer teaches “*tagging restricted or personal information in a content object to distinguish the restricted or personal information from an unrestricted portion of the object content,*” see Fig. 2 and par. 45, “The Authorization Dataset in a rule contains the data items that

Art Unit: 2168

can be released according to the rule. Each authorization data set can be either a View Level 205... Moreover, a data subject can categorize his/her personal data into multiple View Levels (layers) so that the data in each View Level have the same privacy preference, access and authorization constraints, whereas data in different View Levels have different constraints” where the claimed “content object” is the referenced “authorization rule 201” and the claimed “tagging restricted or personal information” is the referenced user categorization of personal data into “View Levels.”

Bohrer teaches “*storing the content object in a federated content repository*,” see par. 17, “it allows a data subject to express complex policies on a large set of personal data in a way that is applicable regardless of the specific representation and data model used by enterprises that store that data.”

Bohrer teaches “*storing the personal identification information of the author in a separate storage device from the federated content repository*,” see Fig. 1 and par. 33, “To facilitate the requests from a Data Subject to setup data profiles and privacy policies... The profiles are stored in a Profile Database 123 while the policies are stored in a Policy Database 124.”

Bohrer teaches “*receiving a request for information by a collection function on a server*,” see par. 32, “a Data Requester 105 can use a web browser 106 or some other computer programs 107 to send requests for data.”

Bohrer teaches “*interrogating a plurality of content sources remote from the server by the collection function to retrieve information to satisfy the request*,” see par. 35, “The Profile

Art Unit: 2168

Responder 116 receives requests for profile information... and uses the Policy authorization engine to check the authorization and privacy policies.”

Bohrer teaches “*collecting the content object from a respective one the plurality of content sources containing the content object in response to the content object being responsive to the request,*” see par. 16, “The data is released only if the privacy declaration of the requester matches the constraints imposed by the data subject via its privacy preferences.”

Bohrer teaches “*distributing the content object to a privacy function on the server,*” see par. 30, “This embodiment supports the enforcement of privacy preferences in data exchanges according to authorization checks based on the privacy preferences specified by a data subject with the privacy policies of a data requester” where the referenced “authorization checks” are the claimed “privacy functions.”

Bohrer teaches “*comparing the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object to policies of the content provider by a compare function of the privacy function,*” see Fig. 5 and par. 82, “For each data item name in the query and in the request item list, the Policy Authorization Engine retrieves any privacy preferences from the authorization rules. It then performs the Policy-Preference matching process (see FIG. 6) for each data item” and par. 5, “the products listed here focus on allowing a complex privacy policy to be represented and checked against either a web site’s privacy policy or a data requester’s privacy policy” where the claimed “content provider” is the referenced “web site’s privacy policy or a data requester’s privacy policy.”

Bohrer teaches “*and distributing the content object based on the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences,*” see Fig. 4b and par. 81, “A data response is... the subset of

Art Unit: 2168

specific data items which were requested and authorized, along with associated privacy declarations representing the data subject's privacy preferences."

Bohrer does not teach "*defining the content object to include the unrestricted portion of the object content in a mark-up language and a link to the restricted or personal information, wherein the content object comprises one of a white paper, a case study, a press release, and an article by an author, wherein the unrestricted portion of the content object includes a title, an abstract, and a description, and wherein the restricted information comprises personal identification information of the author.*" Kohane does, however, see par. 103, "For example, the record owner can place personal identification information within one record object, and the medical information within another record object. Then the record owner can give agents falling within the 'other' role a privilege to read the record object having the medical information, but grant no privileges to the record object with the personal identification information" and par. 38, "In one embodiment, the complete record is represented using an XML directory tree," where the claimed "content object" is the referenced "record," the claimed "unrestricted portion" is the referenced "privilege to read" and the claimed "restricted information" is the referenced "no privileges to the record object." While Kohane does not explicitly teach that the record "comprises one of a white paper, a case study, a press release, and an article," it would be obvious for the record to contain at least a white paper since they are generally confidential, see par. 37, "In other embodiments, the record can include other types of personal or confidential information, such as financial data, legal data, etc." Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited

Art Unit: 2168

references because Kohane's teachings would have allowed Bohrer's method to give a third party access to the record without revealing the identity of the author, see par. 102.

Bohrer does not explicitly teach "*parsing the content object by the privacy function to provide access to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object in response to the content object being collected to satisfy the request.*"

Kohane does, however, see par. 103, "Consequently, when the research institution accesses the record of the record owner, the gateway server system 22 parses through the associated directory file and skips over those record objects for which the research institution is unauthorized" and par. 83, "The gateway server system 22 parses (step 104) through the directory file to determine those record objects that the accessing agent can manipulate according to the specified record operation." Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because Kohane's teachings would have allowed Bohrer's method to give a third party access to the record without revealing the identity of the author, see par. 102. Bohrer does teach "*wherein the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences are remote from the server and are accessed by a secure link,*" see Fig. 1 and par. 32, "Similarly, a Data Requester 105 can use a web browser 106 or some other computer programs 107 to send requests for data 109 as well as receive replies 110 to that request along with any returned data."

11. Bohrer teaches "*The method of claim 1, further comprising locating or accessing privacy preferences or other restriction preferences using another link,*" see Fig. 1 and par. 32, "Similarly, a Data Requester 105 can use a web browser 106 or some other computer programs



Art Unit: 2168

107 to send requests for data 109 as well as receive replies 110 to that request along with any returned data.”

13. Bohrer teaches “*The method of claim 1, further comprising distributing the content object to a requester without any modification to the content object in response to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object being consistent with the content provider’s policies,*” see par. 17, “an independent third party acting as a data-subject’s personal data service and providing various services including... matching privacy policies, gathering data from third parties and releasing and/or authorizing release of data to data requesters.”

14. Bohrer teaches “*The method of claim 1, further comprising: deleting or replacing the restricted or personal information with default or generic information in response to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object being inconsistent with the content provider’s policies,*” see par. 81, “A data response is either a denial, if the request cannot be fulfilled, or the subset of specific data items which were requested and authorized” and Fig. 5 where, see par. 82, “If the result is deny, then the data item is not included in the list of data items to be returned in the response 511” where the claimed “deleting” is the referenced data “not included” in the response.

Bohrer teaches “*repackaging the content object in response to deleting or replacing the restricted or personal information,*” see Fig. 5 and par. 82, “When the entire request list has been processed, the data to be returned is gathered 516.”

Bohrer teaches “*and distributing the repacked content object to a requester without the restricted or personal information which has been deleted ore replaced by the default or generic*

Art Unit: 2168

*information,”* see Fig. 5 and par. 82, “the response structure is constructed and returned to the requester by the Profile Responder 517.”

Claims 15-16 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohrer et al., U.S. 2003/0088520, in view of Fahlman et al., U.S. 5,960,080, and further in view of Kohane et al., U.S. 2004/0199765.

15. Bohrer teaches “*A method for managing privacy or access to restricted information, comprising,*” see par. 1, “methods, systems and business methods to enforce privacy preferences on exchanges of personal data across a network.”

Bohrer teaches “*collecting a content object responsive to a request by a collection function on a server,*” see Fig. 5 and par. 82, “If authentication succeeds, then the data request is passed to the Policy Authorization Engine which retrieves all Authorization Rules of the data subject specified in the request 503.” Bohrer does not teach “*wherein the content object is stored in a federated content repository and personal identification information of an author of the content object is stored in a separate storage device from the federated content repository.*”

Kohane, does, however, see Fig. 1, par. 32, “In one embodiment, the agent system 26 is a computer system that is in communication with one or more legacy data systems 34a and 34b (collectively 34) over a network 30. For example, the legacy data systems 34 can be databases containing confidential records maintained by independent institutions such as hospitals, financial, and legal institutions,” and par. 39, “When the record owner initially connects to the gateway server system 22 (using the agent system 14, 18, or 26), the record owner can control the server 18 upon which the record is stored as an XML directory file,” where the claimed

Art Unit: 2168

“server” is the referenced “server system 22,” the claimed “federated content repository” is the referenced “server 18,” and the claimed “separate storage device” is the referenced “legacy data systems 34a and 34b.” Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because Kohane’s teachings would have allowed Bohrer’s method to gain access to confidential records over a network, see par. 5.

Bohrer teaches “*accessing privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object, wherein the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences are remote from the server,*” see Fig. 5 and par. 82, “the Policy Authorization Engine next compares the privacy declarations in the request with the Privacy Preference Rules in the authorization rules for each profile data item name in the request item 506.”

Bohrer teaches “*comparing the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object to the content provider’s policies,*” see Fig. 5 and par. 82, “For each data item name in the query and in the request item list, the Policy Authorization Engine retrieves any privacy preferences from the authorization rules. It then performs the Policy-Preference matching process (see FIG. 6) for each data item” and par. 5, “the products listed here focus on allowing a complex privacy policy to be represented and checked against either a web site’s privacy policy or a data requester’s privacy policy” where the claimed “content provider” is the referenced “web site’s privacy policy or a data requester’s privacy policy.”

Bohrer teaches “[*deleting*] *private or restricted information... in response to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences being inconsistent with the content provider’s*

Art Unit: 2168

*policies, wherein the content provider collects the content object and has access to the private or restricted information,”* see Figs. 4-5, 7, par. 81, “A data response is either a denial, if the request cannot be fulfilled, or the subset of specific data items which were requested and authorized,” par. 82, “If the result is deny, then the data item is not included in the list of data items to be returned in the response 511” and par. 88, “FIG. 7 is a flow diagram of a routine that enables a gather and filtering process carried out to collect data to be returned to a data requester,” where the claimed “deleting” is the referenced data “not included” in the response. Bohrer does not teach “*replacing private or restricted information with default or generic information.*” Fahlman does, however, see Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 48-53, “In step 105, the identified sensitive terms are replaced with standard tokens. For example, the sensitive term ‘Mr. Johnson’ is replaced by the standard token <person-1>, and the term ‘Jul. 1, 1997’ is replaced by <date-1>.” Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because Fahlman’s teachings would have allowed Bohrer’s method to grant access to an untrusted source without compromising confidentiality, see col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 3.

Bohrer teaches “*repackaging the content object in response to replacing the private or restricted information,*” see Fig. 5 and par. 82, “When the entire request list has been processed, the data to be returned is gathered 516.”

Bohrer teaches “*and distributing the repackaged content object to a requester without the private or restricted information,*” see Fig. 5 and par. 82, “the response structure is constructed and returned to the requester by the Profile Responder 517.”

16. Bohrer teaches “*The method of claim 15, further comprising distributing the content object as originally constituted in response to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences being consistent with the content provider's policies,*” see par. 33, “To facilitate the requests... for data from Data Requesters, the system must provide several different functionalities, including the ability to... authorize release of data based on authorization rules and privacy policy matching and release data.”

20. Bohrer teaches “*The method of claim 15, further comprising distributing any content object in response to the request to a privacy function,*” see par. 30, “This embodiment supports the enforcement of privacy preferences in data exchanges according to authorization checks based on the privacy preferences specified by a data subject with the privacy policies of a data requester’ where the ‘authorization checks’ are considered ‘privacy functions.’”

21. Bohrer teaches “*The method of claim 20, further comprising parsing the content object to provide access to privacy preferences or other restriction preferences,*” see par. 44, “In other words, an Authorization Rule declares that for a specified Authorization Dataset, the specified Privacy Preference Rule is applied for the specified Access List to determine an Authorization Action” and par. 46, “The Access List in a rule declares who can access the specified data set upon Privacy Preference matching” where in order to apply the referenced “Privacy Preference Rule” to the “Access List,” the “Privacy Preference Rule” must be “parsed.”

22. Bohrer teaches “*The method of claim 21, further comprising locating or accessing the privacy preferences or restriction preferences using a link,*” see Fig. 1 where, see par. 32, “Similarly, a Data Requester 105 can use a web browser 106 or some other computer programs

Art Unit: 2168

107 to send requests for data 109 as well as receive replies 110 to that request along with any returned data.”

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant’s arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. As per claim 1, Applicant has incorporated the limitations of cancelled claims 4-7 and 9, which were properly rejected in the Office action mailed 28 May 2008, but has not presented arguments regarding their patentability over the cited prior art. Likewise, claim 15 incorporates limitations of claim 1, but Applicant has not presented arguments regarding their patentability over the prior art.

As per Applicant’s argument that Bohrer and Kohane do not teach “*storing the content object in a federated content repository*” as in claim 1, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Examiner cited Bohrer par. 17, “it allows a data subject to express complex policies on a large set of personal data in a way that is applicable regardless of the specific representation and data model used by enterprises that store that data.”

As per Applicant’s argument that Bohrer and Kohane do not teach “*storing the personal identification information of the author in a separate storage device from the federated content repository*” as in claim 1, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Examiner cited Bohrer Fig. 1 and par. 33, “To facilitate the requests from a Data Subject to setup data profiles and privacy policies... The profiles are stored in a Profile Database 123 while the policies are stored in a Policy Database 124.”

Art Unit: 2168

As per Applicant's argument that Bohrer and Kohane do not teach "*receiving a request for information by a collection function on a server*" as in claim 1, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Examiner cited Bohrer par. 32, "a Data Requester 105 can use a web browser 106 or some other computer programs 107 to send requests for data."

As per Applicant's argument that Bohrer and Kohane do not teach "*interrogating a plurality of content sources remote from the server by the collection function to retrieve information to satisfy the request*" as in claim 1, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Examiner cited Bohrer par. 35, "The Profile Responder 116 receives requests for profile information... and uses the Policy authorization engine to check the authorization and privacy policies."

As per Applicant's argument that Bohrer and Kohane do not teach "*collecting the content object from a respective one the plurality of content sources containing the content object in response to the content object being responsive to the request*" as in claim 1, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Examiner cited Bohrer par. 16, "The data is released only if the privacy declaration of the requester matches the constraints imposed by the data subject via its privacy preferences."

As per Applicant's argument that Bohrer and Kohane do not teach "*distributing the content object to a privacy function on the server*" as in claim 1, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Examiner cited Bohrer par. 30, "This embodiment supports the enforcement of privacy preferences in data exchanges according to authorization checks based on the privacy preferences specified by a data subject with the privacy policies of a data requester" where the referenced "authorization checks" are the claimed "privacy functions."

Art Unit: 2168

As per Applicant's argument that Bohrer and Kohane do not teach "*parsing the content object by the privacy function to provide access to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object in response to the content object being collected to satisfy the request*" as in claim 1, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Examiner cited Kohane par. 103, "Consequently, when the research institution accesses the record of the record owner, the gateway server system 22 parses through the associated directory file and skips over those record objects for which the research institution is unauthorized" and par. 83, "The gateway server system 22 parses (step 104) through the directory file to determine those record objects that the accessing agent can manipulate according to the specified record operation." Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because Kohane's teachings would have allowed Bohrer's method to give a third party access to the record without revealing the identity of the author, see par. 102. Bohrer teaches "*wherein the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences are remote from the server and are accessed by a secure link,*" see Fig. 1 and par. 32, "Similarly, a Data Requester 105 can use a web browser 106 or some other computer programs 107 to send requests for data 109 as well as receive replies 110 to that request along with any returned data."

As per Applicant's argument that Bohrer and Kohane do not teach "*collecting a content object responsive to a request by a collection function on a server*" as in claim 15, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Examiner cited Bohrer Fig. 5 and par. 82, "If authentication succeeds, then the data request is passed to the Policy Authorization Engine which retrieves all Authorization Rules of the data subject specified in the request 503." Bohrer does



Art Unit: 2168

not teach “*wherein the content object is stored in a federated content repository and personal identification information of an author of the content object is stored in a separate storage device from the federated content repository.*” Kohane, does, however, see Fig. 1, par. 32, “In one embodiment, the agent system 26 is a computer system that is in communication with one or more legacy data systems 34a and 34b (collectively 34) over a network 30. For example, the legacy data systems 34 can be databases containing confidential records maintained by independent institutions such as hospitals, financial, and legal institutions,” and par. 39, “When the record owner initially connects to the gateway server system 22 (using the agent system 14, 18, or 26), the record owner can control the server 18 upon which the record is stored as an XML directory file,” where the claimed “server” is the referenced “server system 22,” the claimed “federated content repository” is the referenced “server 18,” and the claimed “separate storage device” is the referenced “legacy data systems 34a and 34b.” Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because Kohane’s teachings would have allowed Bohrer’s method to gain access to confidential records over a network, see par. 5.

As per Applicant’s argument that Bohrer and Kohane do not teach “*accessing privacy preferences or other restriction preferences of the author or owner of the content object, wherein the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences are remote from the server*” as in claim 15, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Examiner cited Bohrer Fig. 5 and par. 82, “the Policy Authorization Engine next compares the privacy declarations in the request with the Privacy Preference Rules in the authorization rules for each profile data item name in the request item 506.”

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2168

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Sanders whose telephone number is 571-270-1016. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00a-4:00p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tim T. Vo/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
2168

/Aaron Sanders/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2168  
23 September 2008